



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/762,439

01/22/2004

Paul Ashton

CDSI-P01-041

5180

28120 7590 07/08/2010

ROPES & GRAY LLP
PATENT DOCKETING 39/41
ONE INTERNATIONAL PLACE
BOSTON, MA 02110-2624

EXAMINER

SASAN, ARADHANA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1615

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/08/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Application

1. The Request for Continued Examination filed on 02/02/10 is acknowledged.
2. Claims 1-14, 17-18 and 21 are pending. Claims 4-9 and 11-13 were withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-3, 10, 14, 17-18 and 21 are included in the prosecution.
3. No amendments were made.

Continued Examination under 37 CFR 1.114

4. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, Applicant's submission filed on 02/02/10 has been entered.
5. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b).

MAINTAINED REJECTIONS:

The following is a list of maintained rejections:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-3, 10, 14, and 17 **remain** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. (US 5,378,475) in view of Wong et al. (US 6,331,313) and further in view of Heller et al. (US 3,811,444).

The claimed invention is a sustained release drug device adapted for implantation in or adjacent to the eye of a patient, the drug delivery device comprising:

(i) an inner drug core comprising an adrenergic agent and a matrix material wherein said adrenergic agent is admixed in the matrix material to inhibit or prevent decomposition of the adrenergic agent; (ii) a first coating on the surface of the drug core, that is substantially impermeable to the passage of the adrenergic agent, having one or more openings therein which permit diffusion of the adrenergic agent, and which is substantially insoluble and inert in body fluids and compatible with body tissues; and (iii) one or more additional coatings that are permeable to the passage of the adrenergic agent, are substantially insoluble and inert in body fluids and compatible with body tissues and comprise an adrenergic agent that is the same or different as the adrenergic agent of the inner drug core; wherein the first and additional coatings are disposed

Art Unit: 1615

about the inner drug core so as to produce, when implanted, a substantially constant rate of release of the adrenergic agent from the device. The first coating is stable during the release period.

Smith teaches a sustained release drug delivery device including an inner core or reservoir with the active ingredient and coating layers (Abstract). The first coating layer is “essentially impermeable to the passage of the effective agent, and a second coating permeable to the passage of the effective agent” (Col. 1, lines 6-12). The invention includes “an ocular device suitable for direct implantation into the vitreous of the eye” which provides “sustained controlled release of various compositions to treat the eye without risk of detrimental side effects” (Col. 3, lines 38-43). Further, Smith teaches that “the devices are particularly suitable for treating ocular conditions such as glaucoma” (Col. 5, lines 28-29). The active ingredients in the inner core of the device include carbonic anhydrase inhibitors (Col. 5, line 58).

Smith does not expressly teach a bioerodible polymer matrix in the core mixed with the adrenergic agent.

Wong teaches a controlled release biocompatible ocular drug delivery device that can be implanted in the eye (Abstract). The device comprises “a substantially impermeable polymeric outer layer covering a core which comprises the drug to be delivered ...” (Col. 1, lines 56-59). The device “is implanted in the eye to treat or prevent a variety of conditions of the eye such as ... ocular pressure...” (Col. 8, lines 12-15). Wong, teaches that the drug “may also be present as a solution or be dispersed in a

Art Unit: 1615

polymer matrix. The polymers used in the matrix with the drug are bio-compatible with body tissues and body fluids and can be biodegradable or substantially insoluble in the body fluids" (Col. 10, lines 35-39). Biodegradable polymers that can be used with the drug in the core are disclosed (Col. 9, line 60 to Col. 10, line 9).

Smith and Wong do not expressly teach an outer or second layer comprising an adrenergic agent that is the same or different as the adrenergic agent of the inner drug core.

Heller teaches an ocular insert for the continuous controlled administration of a therapeutically effective dosage of drug to the eye over a prolonged period of time (Abstract). Figure 4 illustrates a bioerodible ocular insert comprised of a series of three concentric layers where the outer layer comprises particles of drug (Col. 13, lines 5-12). Heller teaches that "many variations of the device of FIG. 4 will be apparent to those skilled in the art of drug delivery. For example ... a variety of drugs or dosages may be employed in the several layers ..." (Col. 13, lines 27-33). Heller teaches epinephrine (an adrenergic agent) that is a suitable drug for use in the ocular insert (Col. 14, lines 30-54).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the sustained release drug delivery device for an ocular implant, as suggested by Smith, combine it with the implantable ocular drug delivery device including an adrenergic agent and a bioerodible polymer matrix core, as suggested by Wong, further combine it with the outer layer of an ocular insert that comprises a drug, as suggested by Heller, and produce the instant invention.

Art Unit: 1615

One of ordinary skill in the art would do this because Smith teaches using the device for treating glaucoma and Wong teaches using the device for treating high ocular pressure and includes specific adrenergic agents. One of ordinary skill in the art would use adrenergic agents in the device to treat high ocular pressure that is associated with glaucoma. As mentioned earlier, the device allows sustained controlled release of the active “without risk of detrimental side effects” (Col. 3, lines 40-43). One of ordinary skill in the art would find it obvious to incorporate a drug in the outer layer of the sustained release drug device in order to provide immediate release of the drug. Variable drug release from the outer layer of an ocular insert is evidenced by the teaching of Heller (Col. 13, lines 5-33).

From the teachings of the references, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole was *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Regarding instant claims 1-2 and 14 the limitations of a sustained release drug delivery device for implantation in the eye, an inner core comprising an adrenergic agent, a first coating that is substantially impermeable to the passage of the adrenergic agent, one or more additional coatings that are permeable to the passage of the adrenergic agent would have been obvious over the sustained release drug delivery device for an ocular implant teaching of Smith in view of the adrenergic agents and the drug in the bioerodible polymer matrix, as taught by Wong. Smith teaches a first coating

Art Unit: 1615

layer that is “essentially impermeable to the passage of the agent” and a second coating layer that is “permeable to the passage of the agent” (Col. 3, lines 15-29). The first coating layer being impermeable to the passage of the agent controls “the release of the agent out of the drug delivery device” (Col. 7, lines 10-15). The limitation of the adrenergic agent admixed in the matrix material would have been obvious over the teaching by Wong that the drug “may also be present as a solution or be dispersed in a polymer matrix. The polymers used in the matrix with the drug are bio-compatible with body tissues and body fluids and can be biodegradable or substantially insoluble in the body fluids” (Col. 10, lines 35-39). Biodegradable polymers that can be used with the drug in the core are disclosed (Col. 9, line 60 to Col. 10, line 9). When the adrenergic agent is mixed with a substantially insoluble polymer and the mixture is present in the core, one of ordinary skill in art would expect to inhibit or prevent the decomposition of the adrenergic agent with a reasonable expectation of success. The limitation of an outer or second layer comprising an adrenergic agent that is the same or different as the adrenergic agent of the inner drug core would have been obvious over the outer layer of an ocular insert that comprises a drug, and over the epinephrine suggested by Heller (Col. 13, lines 5-33).

The limitations of the impermeable coating having sufficient dimensional stability of instant claims 2 and 3 would have been obvious over the teaching in Smith that “devices formed of polymeric materials that are insoluble in tear fluid retain their shape and integrity during the course of the needed therapy ...” (Col. 2, lines 18-21). “Materials that may be suitable for fabricating the first or second coating layer of the

Art Unit: 1615

device include naturally occurring or synthetic materials that are biologically compatible with body fluids and eye tissues, and essentially insoluble in body fluids with which the material will come in contact” (Col. 6, lines 30-35). Therefore, a person having ordinary skill in the art would find that an ocular implant device comprised of coating materials that are insoluble in eye fluids would retain its shape and integrity during the course of therapy.

The limitation of the adrenergic agent of instant claim 10 would have been obvious over the timolol and betaxolol disclosed as components of the inner core of the device by Smith (Col. 5, lines 51-52) and over the epinephrine taught by Heller (Col. 14, lines 30-54).

Regarding instant claim 17, the limitation of co-extruding the inner drug core and the coating layer would have been obvious over the method of extrusion used to prepare the devices and the outer layers, as taught by Wong (Col. 14, line 65 to Col. 15, line 2). It is noted that the instant claim 17 is set forth in the form of product-by-process claims, which are considered product claims by the Office. Applicants are reminded that process limitations cannot impart patentability to a product that is not patentably distinguished over the prior art. In *re Thorpe et al.* (CAFC 1985), *supra*; In *re Dike* (CCPA 1968) 394 F2d 584, 157 USPQ 581; *Tri-Wall Containers, Inc. v. United States et al.* (Ct Cls 1969) 408 F2d 748, 161 USPQ 116; In *re Brown et al.* (CCPA 1972) 450 F2d 531, 173 USPQ 685; *Ex parte Edwards et al.* (BPAI 1986) 231 USPQ 981.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments, see Page 1, filed 12/21/09, with respect to the rejection of claims 1-3, 10, 14 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. (US 5,378,475) in view of Wong et al. (US 6,331,313) and further in view of Heller et al. (US 3,811,444) have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that whether the instant claims require a biodegradable system or not is not relevant. Applicants assert that they are addressing the issue of whether one of skill in the art would have the motivation to combine Smith and/or Wong, which both teach non-bioerodible devices with the teaching of Heller which teaches only bioerodible devices to arrive at a device of the pending claims.

This is not persuasive because instant claims require (i) an inner drug core comprising a carbonic anhydrase inhibitor (CAI) and a matrix material, (ii) a first coating that is substantially impermeable to the passage of the CAI, and (iii) an additional coating permeable to the passage of the CAI and comprising a CAI. Smith teaches an inner core with the active ingredient, a first coating layer that is essentially impermeable to the passage of the active ingredient, and a second coating permeable to the passage of the active ingredient. Therefore, the components of the sustained release drug device are taught by Smith. Instant claims do not require a biodegradable system and therefore, the argument with respect to biodegradability is not commensurate in scope with the instant claims.

Applicants assert that neither Smith nor Wong teaches or suggests a device wherein the rate of release of the drug relies on the bioerodibility of the device, and in

Art Unit: 1615

fact, both Smith and Wong emphasize the importance of non-biodegradability to ensure the desired release profiles. Applicants assert that in view of both Smith and Wong, a person of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to look to the teachings of non-bioerodible (at least during the term of release) devices in order to obtain linear release of drug.

This is not persuasive because the structural components of the drug delivery device as required by instant claims are taught by Smith, Wong, and Heller (i.e., the inner core comprising the CAI and matrix, the first coating that is substantially impermeable to the passage of the CAI, and the additional coating permeable to the passage of the CAI). The bioerodible polymer matrix would have been obvious over the teaching by Wong that the drug "may also be present as a solution or be dispersed in a polymer matrix. Wong also teaches examples of biodegradable polymers that can be used in the device where "the outer layer degrades after the drug has been released for the desired duration" (Col. 9, lines 43-45 and lines 60-67, Col. 10, lines 1-9). The teaching of Heller is properly combined with the teachings of Smith and Wong because all the prior art references teach a controlled or sustained release drug delivery device suitable for ocular insertion/implantation and one of ordinary skill in the art would find it obvious to incorporate a drug in the outer layer of the sustained release device in order to provide immediate release of the drug (variable drug release from the outer layer of an ocular insert is taught by Heller (Col. 13, lines 5-33)).

Applicants argue that the Office Action merely states that the instant claims are taught by Smith, Wong, and Heller and further that Heller is properly combined with the

Art Unit: 1615

teachings of Smith and Wong because all of the references teach a controlled or sustained release drug delivery device suitable for ocular insertion.

This is not persuasive because MPEP 2143 states that it is obvious to apply a known technique to a known device (method, or product) ready for improvement to yield predictable results.

Applicants argue that "the Examiner is using impermissible hindsight to combine the cited references despite the fact that both Smith and Wong expressly discourage release of drug through a degradation process as taught by Heller. The mere fact that Smith, Wong, and Heller all teach devices suitable for ocular implantation is inadequate to establish a motivation to combine when the express teachings of each of the references are considered."

This is not persuasive because it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Therefore, the rejection of 3/20/09 is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. Claims 18 and 21 **remain** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. (US 5,902,598) in view of Wong et al. (US 6,331,313) and further in view of Heller et al. (US 3,811,444).

Art Unit: 1615

Chen teaches sustained release drug delivery devices “suitable for treating ailments affecting the eye” (Col. 2, lines 5-6). Chen discloses an “ocular device suitable for direct implantation into the vitreous of the eye” which provides “sustained controlled release of various compositions to treat the eye without risk of detrimental side effects” (Col. 4, lines 6-11). The “device includes an inner core or reservoir which contains an agent effective in obtaining a desired effect. The device further includes a first coating layer, a second coating layer and a third coating layer. The first coating layer ... is permeable to the passage of the effective agent ...” (Col. 4, lines 53-58). The device is “particularly suitable for treating ocular conditions such as glaucoma ...” (Col. 5, lines 65-66). Chen teaches antiglaucoma drugs such as the beta-blockers timolol and betaxolol (Col. 6, lines 5-19).

Chen does not expressly teach an outer or second layer comprising an adrenergic agent that is the same or different as the adrenergic agent of the inner drug core.

The teaching of Wong (with respect to biodegradable polymers that can be used with the drug in the core) is stated above. Wong also teaches the drugs timolol, betaxolol and epinephrine that may be used in the ocular device (Col. 10, lines 55-60 and Col. 11, line 18).

Chen and Wong do not expressly teach an outer or second layer comprising an adrenergic agent that is the same or different as the adrenergic agent of the inner drug core.

The teaching of Heller (with respect to the outer layer of an ocular insert that comprises a drug) is stated above.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the sustained release drug delivery device for an ocular implant including drugs such as adrenergic agents timolol and betaxolol, as suggested by Chen, combine it with the implantable ocular drug delivery device including adrenergic agents (beta blockers) and a bioerodible polymer matrix core, as suggested by Wong, further combine it with the outer layer of an ocular insert that comprises a drug, as suggested by Heller, and produce the instant invention.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because Chen teaches using the device for treating glaucoma and Wong teaches using the device for treating high ocular pressure and includes beta blockers as the drugs that may be used. One of ordinary skill in the art would use the adrenergic agents in the device to treat high ocular pressure that is associated with glaucoma. Chen teaches a device that allows sustained controlled release of the active “without risk of detrimental side effects” (Col. 4, lines 6-11). One of ordinary skill in the art would find it obvious to incorporate a drug in the outer layer of the sustained release drug device in order to provide immediate release of the drug. Variable drug release from the outer layer of an ocular insert is evidenced by the teaching of Heller (Col. 13, lines 5-33).

Regarding instant claim 18 the limitations of a sustained release drug delivery device for implantation in the eye, an inner core comprising an adrenergic agent, a first coating that is substantially impermeable to the passage of the adrenergic agent, one or

Art Unit: 1615

more additional coatings that are permeable to the passage of the adrenergic agent would have been obvious over the sustained release drug delivery device for an ocular implant teaching of Chen in view of the adrenergic agents and the drug in the bioerodible polymer matrix, as taught by Wong. The limitation of the adrenergic agent admixed in the matrix material would have been obvious over the teaching by Wong that the drug “may also be present as a solution or be dispersed in a polymer matrix. The polymers used in the matrix with the drug are bio-compatible with body tissues and body fluids and can be biodegradable or substantially insoluble in the body fluids” (Col. 10, lines 35-39). Biodegradable polymers that can be used with the drug in the core are disclosed (Col. 9, line 60 to Col. 10, line 9). When the adrenergic agent is mixed with a substantially insoluble polymer and the mixture is present in the core, one of ordinary skill in art would expect to inhibit or prevent the decomposition of the adrenergic agent with a reasonable expectation of success. The limitation of an outer or second layer comprising an adrenergic agent that is the same or different as the adrenergic agent of the inner drug core would have been obvious over the outer layer of an ocular insert that comprises a drug, as suggested by Heller (Col. 13, lines 5-33).

Regarding instant claim 21, the limitation of co-extruding the inner drug core and the coating layer would have been obvious over the method of extrusion used to prepare the devices and the outer layers, as taught by Wong (Col. 14, line 65 to Col. 15, line 2). It is noted that the instant claim 21 is set forth in the form of product-by-process claims, which are considered product claims by the Office. Applicants are reminded that process limitations cannot impart patentability to a product that is not patentably

Art Unit: 1615

distinguished over the prior art. In *re Thorpe et al.* (CAFC 1985), *supra*; In *re Dike* (CCPA 1968) 394 F2d 584, 157 USPQ 581; *Tri-Wall Containers, Inc. v. United States et al.* (Ct Cls 1969) 408 F2d 748, 161 USPQ 116; In *re Brown et al.* (CCPA 1972) 450 F2d 531, 173 USPQ 685; *Ex parte Edwards et al.* (BPAI 1986) 231 USPQ 981.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments, see Page 4, filed 12/21/09, with respect to the rejection of claims 18 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. (US 5,902,598) in view of Wong et al. (US 6,331,313) and further in view of Heller et al. (US 3,811,444) have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that they are addressing the issue of whether one of skill in the art would have the motivation to combine Chen and/or Wong, which both teach non-bioerodible devices with the teaching of Heller which teaches only bioerodible devices to arrive at a device of the pending claims. Applicants argue that Chen teaches away from the use of bioerodible systems for obtaining reliable release rates over extended periods of time. Applicants argue that the office action has provided no motivation to combine the teaching of Heller with the teachings of Chen or Wong and assert that the Examiner is using impermissible hindsight to combine the cited references.

This is not persuasive the components of the sustained release drug device are taught by Chen. Instant claims do not require a biodegradable system and therefore, the argument with respect to biodegradability is not commensurate in scope with the instant claims. The structural components of the drug delivery device as required by instant claims are taught by Chen, Wong and Heller (i.e., the inner core comprising the CAI and

Art Unit: 1615

matrix, the first coating that is substantially impermeable to the passage of the CAI, and the additional coating permeable to the passage of the CAI). The teaching of Heller is properly combined with the teachings of Chen and Wong because all the prior art references teach a controlled or sustained release drug delivery device suitable for ocular insertion/implantation and one of ordinary skill in the art would find it obvious to incorporate a drug in the outer layer of the sustained release device in order to provide immediate release of the drug (variable drug release from the outer layer of an ocular insert is taught by Heller (Col. 13, lines 5-33)). MPEP 2143 states that it is obvious to apply a known technique to a known device (method, or product) ready for improvement to yield predictable results. Moreover, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Therefore, the rejection of 3/20/09 is maintained.

Double Patenting

11. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not

Art Unit: 1615

identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

12. Claims 1-3, 14, 17-18 and 21 **remain** provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3, 14, 17-18 and 21 of copending Application No. 10/762,421 (the '421 Application).

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are drawn to a sustained release drug device for implantation in or adjacent to the eye of a patient. The difference is that instant claims

Art Unit: 1615

are drawn to the drug core comprising an adrenergic agent and claims of the '421 Application are drawn to the drug core comprising a carbonic anhydrase inhibitor. One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to use different drugs in the sustained release drug device based on the desired therapeutic effect in the eye. The instant Specification discloses the use of carbonic anhydrase inhibitors from the drug core (as illustrated in Figure 1 and on Page 28, paragraphs 1-3). The instant application discloses the use of carbonic anhydrase inhibitors for the treatment of glaucoma (Pages 1-2).

Since the instant application claims a sustained release drug device for implantation in or adjacent to the eye of a patient, it is obvious over the claims of the '421 Application, and thus they are not patentably distinct over each other.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments, see Page 6, filed 12/21/09, with respect to the provisional rejection of claims 1-3, 14, 16-18 and 20-21 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3, 14, 17-18 and 21 of copending Application No. 10/762,421 have been fully considered. Applicants agree to submit a terminal disclaimer at the appropriate time, if necessary. Until such time that a terminal disclaimer is filed and approved, the provisional nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection will be maintained.

Art Unit: 1615

Conclusion

14. No claims are allowed.

15. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aradhana Sasan whose telephone number is (571) 272-9022. The examiner can normally be reached Monday to Thursday from 6:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert A. Wax, can be reached at 571-272-0623. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Aradhana Sasan/

Examiner, Art Unit 1615

/Humera N. Sheikh/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1615